

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, and 8-14 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

#### Amendment

Independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 14 have been amended to clarify that the setting is made in advance, and that the search result is emailed even if the electronic mail notification is set to not automatically execute when the user operates one of the displayed first or second button. No new matter has been introduced.

#### Art Rejection

Claims 1, 5, and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay (USP 5,502,576) in view of Kuzma (USP 5,781,901) and Larky (USP 6,970,908). Claim 3 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Kuzma, Larky, and Seder (USPGP 2002/0164053). Lastly, claims 2 and 8 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Kuzma, Larky, and Cullen (USP 5,893,908).

Independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 14 call for setting **in advance**, based on a user operation, (1) whether or not the searched electronic document data file is to be attached to an email notification and (2) whether or not the email notification is automatically executed. Both (1) and (2) are set in advance. These claims further call for (3) emailing the search result, including information indicative of a location where the searched original electronic document data is stored, when the user operates one of the first or second button displayed in the operating section, even if the electronic mail notification is set to not automatically execute.

In contrast to the examiner's assertion, Kuzma does not disclose or teach the above claimed setting features (1) and (2). Indeed, as explicitly disclosed in Kuzma's column 5, lines 45-50, it is the recipient who manually retrieves the attachment if he or she so desires. Kuzma thus teaches MANUALLY retrieving the attachment. Moreover, the recipient manually retrieving the attachment does not correspond to the automatic sending of the attachment, which happens regardless of whether the recipient manually retrieves it or not. Kuzma simply would not have disclosed or taught setting in advance whether the searched data file is to be attached to an email and automatically executing it, as set forth in the independent claims.

Kuzuma also fails to disclose or teach the third claimed feature above. That is, Kuzma fails to disclose or teach sending the attachment regardless of the setting when the one of the displayed button is operated. In fact, Kuzma would have taught away from providing the third feature since Kuzma explicitly calls for not sending the attachment to save bandwidth. In

Kuzma, the recipient manually retrieves the attachment if he or she so desires. The third claimed feature above is akin to sending the attachment regardless of whether the recipient wants it or not.

Based on the foregoing differences, applicant submits that none of the applied references would have taught the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

*/Lyle Kimms/*

LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

23 MARCH 2009

DATE

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150  
ASHBURN, VA 20147  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)